

AMENDMENT(S) TO THE DRAWINGS:

Kindly amend FIG. 1 as follows and as shown in the attached annotated figures. Each attached sheet of such annotated figure(s) is titled "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes". Replacement figures that show the desired changes are attached, and each attached sheet of such replacement figure(s) is titled "Replacement Sheet".

Kindly add the box labeled Pointing device 101. Kindly add the box labeled Circuit 200. Kindly add the box shown as "Transmitter(s), other elements of pointing device 101 (transmitter system)." Kindly move the arrow and label System 100 to not obscure other elements.

REMARKS

Status of the Application:

Claims 1–25 are the claims of record of the application. Claims 1–25 have been rejected.

Drawing Objection

In paragraph 1 of the office action, the drawings were objected to as being incomplete. In particular, the examiner has asserted that in Fig. 1 system (100) it is not clear what system is part of the pointing device (140). Of course each drawing is accompanied by relevant parts of the written description. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of FIG. 1. For example, Paragraph [0049] clearly states:

[0049] In one embodiment, the system 100 is included in a pointing device, such as a portable transmitter pen or similar pointing device, and the plurality of sensors 140 includes a plurality of buttons or switches capable of being manipulator or triggered by a user, such as for example a person holding the transmitter pen.

Therefore, it is clear that FIG. 1 is part of the pointing device. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended FIG. 1 to clearly indicate that the system 100 is part of the pointing device, and further, that the pointing device includes other elements, such as at least one transmitter. See for example, paragraph [0036] where it is stated "This detailed description describes a portable pointing device that includes a transmitter."

With respect to circuit 200 FIG. 2, the Examiner asserts what parts are in FIG. 2 are not clear. Regarding FIG. 2, paragraph [0067] states"

[0067] The system 100 includes a circuit 200, which includes the power source 110, the power regulator 120, the operational circuit 130, the plurality of sensors 140, and the on-off circuit 150.

Therefore, it is clear that FIG. 2 includes an embodiment of those elements of system 100 which is in the pointing device. So Applicants disagree that what is in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 is not clear. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended FIG. 1 to clearly indicate that the system 100 is part of the pointing device, and further, that the pointing device includes other elements, such as at least one transmitter. See for example, paragraph [0036] where it is stated "This detailed description describes a portable pointing device that includes a transmitter." Applicants also have amended FIG. 1 to clearly indicate that circuit 200, includes the power source 110, the power regulator 120, the operational circuit 130, the plurality of sensors 140, and the on-off circuit 150. Such is already indicated in FIG. 2 itself.

No new matter is being added by the amending of the drawings.

With respect to FIGS. 3 and 4, the examiner has asserted that it is not clear which figure is based on those steps of method and state transition diagram. Several paragraphs in the description identify what is described in FIGS. 3 and 4. As state in paragraph[[0078] and elsewhere. The method 300 is carried out by the circuit 200 of FIG. 2 which is part of system 100, which is part of the pointing device. The method 300 includes some sensors being activated, e.g., buttons being pressed by a user of the pointing device 101. The states shown in FIG. 4 also are related to the other drawings. For example, in paragraph [00100], it is stated that “the system 100 (and thus the circuit 200) is at all times in one of these states.”

Hence, the Examiner’s objection has been overcome. FIG. 1 has been amended.

An *Appendix* including amended drawings is attached following the *Remarks/arguments*.

Amendment to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to add reference numeral 101 to correspond to the amendment to FIG. 1. No new matter is being added.

Amendment to the Claims:

Applicants have amended the claims to clearly point out, for example, in claims 1–12, that the apparatus is in a system that is included in a pointing device, in claims 17–25 that the circuit being claimed is in a system that is included in a pointing device, and in claims 13–16 that the method being claimed is of operating a system included in a pointing device.

The applicants have also amended the claims to deal with the rejections under 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 2 of the office action, claims 1–25 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Arrigo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,781,570, hereinafter “Arrigo”).

The applicants have amended each the claims to add the following features:

- 1) each sensor is one of a proximity sensor, a touch sensor operative to detect whether the pointing device is touching an active area, or a button sensor operative to detect whether a button is pressed by a user.
- 2) each sensor includes a passive switch coupled to a corresponding resistor and a power source, such that for each particular sensor, no power is consumed by the particular sensor and its corresponding resistor unless there is a triggering event for the particular sensor, and such that as a result of a triggering event for the particular sensor, there is a current flowing through the corresponding resistor,

- 3) a sensor signal indicative of a voltage drop across the resistor corresponding to the particular sensor is coupled to the operational circuit to that there has been a triggering event.

Arrigo does not include such a feature.

In the rejection, the examiner asserted that Arrigo shows coupling between an identifiable resistor, and a sensor signal indicative of a voltage drop across that identifiable resistor, and refers to element 125 in FIG. 1b. Applicants cannot find such a reference. Element 125 is clearly a user interface, and described starting in Arrigo col. 3, line 43. There is no identifiable resistor described.

As per claim 17, the examiner asserts col. 10 lines 35–54 describe such a structure.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The only two structures described in Col. 10 lines 35–54 are AND gates (that require power) and using the microprocessor in low power consumption mode (“less than 100 microamps”). Clearly Arrigo’s concept of low power consumption is different from the present invention’s. The present invention includes sensors-resistor combination that consumes **no power** prior to a triggering event, and a complete circuit that consumes no more than 1.5 microamps when inactive.

Similarly, with respect to claim 19, the examiner asserts FIGS. 1a and/or 1b show the structure, including the resistors. There is no such structure shown in FIG. 1a or FIG. 1b.

To make clearer, applicants have added to claim 17 and to claim 19:

--wherein each sensor includes a corresponding on-off switch such that the combination of the sensor and its corresponding resistor consumes no power unless the sensor is triggered.—

Regarding claim 18, the examiner asserts that in col. 11 lines 10–20, Arrigo shows the relatively low voltage has the effect of providing a current of about 0.5 micro amps when none of the sensors are triggered. Just to (respectfully) demonstrate that the cited paragraph does not disclose Applicant’s invention, Arrigo states “For instance, walk mode 210 might conserve 75% power as compared to full power of run mode 205. Similarly, sleep mode 215 might conserve 90% power as compared to full power of run mode 205, while deep sleep mode 220 might conserve 95% power as compared to full power of run mode 205. Hibernate mode, on the other hand, might conserve 99% power as compared to full power of run mode 205.” None of this is as low as 0.5 microamps.

Applicant assert that the claims, as amended, are novel and non-obvious, thus allowable over the cited prior art.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendment, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

The Applicants believe all of Examiner's rejections have been overcome with respect to all remaining claims (as amended), and that the remaining claims are allowable. Action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments that would advance the prosecution and allowance of this application, an email message to the undersigned at dov@inventek.com, or a telephone call to the undersigned at +1-510-547-3378 is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

January 17, 2007

Date

/Dov Rosenfeld/ #38687

Dov Rosenfeld, Reg. No. 38687

Address for correspondence:

Dov Rosenfeld
5507 College Avenue, Suite 2,
Oakland, CA 94618
Tel. 510-547-3378
Fax: +1-510-291-2985
Email: dov@inventek.com

Our Ref./Docket No: LUID309

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPENDIX: DRAWINGS

(Replacement drawing(s) and annotated sheet(s))